

Fairfax County Pre-Disaster Recovery Plan (PDRP)

Steering Committee Meeting #6

March 2, 2011

Fairfax County MPSTOC

In Attendance:

Dave McKernan-Fairfax Office of Emergency Management (OEM)

Amanda Phan-Fairfax OEM

Hal Cohen-Witt Associates

Lindsey Holman-Witt Associates

Ian Sterne-Citizen Corps /NCR Red Cross

Matt Lyttle-Volunteer Fairfax

Bill Bolton-Dulles Chamber of Commerce/AH&T Insurance

Phyllis Black-Springfield Chamber of Commerce/Rose Hill Texaco

Ronald Kirkpatrick-Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)

Carol Lamborn- Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)

Brian Heffern-Department Management and Budget

Jim Person- Public Information Office

Dr. Jim Stratoudakis- Mental Health Services

John Turner- Housing and Community Development

Eric Teitelman-Fairfax Department of Transportation

Marilyn McHugh-Office of County Attorney

Welcome and (re)introductions

Ms. Phan thanked attendees for coming and provided an overview of today's agenda. Due to the housing recovery functions have pre-disaster tasks identified, Amanda noted that there may be some cases where agencies and departments are beginning to do some of the tasks that are outlined in the section.

Updates

Ms. Phan requested that the group take turns in providing an update on their department's actions regarding the pre-disaster tasks for a particular function (there were no updates). Ms. Phan explained that OEM is about to do a brochure that talks about this initiative, it had been requested by committee members for distribution at their individual meetings with stakeholders. Ms. Phan then asked if anybody is interested in having copies of the brochure. The EOP revision is still ongoing; the planning team is working on getting the stakeholders from county agencies together.

Mr. McKernan stated that the focus groups are currently meeting.

Ms. Phan advised the NOVA Hazard Mitigation plan draft has been posted for public review; however the section regarding human caused hazards is excluded.

Mr. McKernan stated that his understanding is that it is done and posted; we need to provide two means of public review.

Ms. Phan stated the entire plan is posted for public review except for the human caused hazard portion. Which will not be public anyway, is not posted. She then will let Hal go over the work done so far with the focus groups. Ms. Phan stated that the planning team has met with equity advocates, chambers of commerce, and the finance, insurance, and real estate sector focus groups recently. The environmental advocate's focus group meeting has yet to be held.

Mr. Cohen suggested the steering committee re-introduce themselves and provide a department update on any pre-disaster task issues being addressed.

Mr. Stratoudakis informed the group that Mental Health Services now has 123 staff trained to deploy for sheltering, disaster psychology, and first-aid.

Mr. Cohen stated that the Recovery Function (RF) agency tables with lead and support agencies have been drafted and there is now a comprehensive list of agencies and are about to run that by the county executive's office. The planning team will then have the agencies review to make sure they are comfortable with their role. The working group meeting took place a few weeks ago, the evaluations were generally positive and the comments during the meeting provided some good information.

Mr. Kirkpatrick asked if the planning team has contacted Knoll Kaplan, with the Environmental Quality Advisory Committee. The Board relies heavily on the committee regarding environmental issues in the county. He would be a good addition to the environmental focus group.

Discuss Previously Reviewed Draft Plan Elements

Mr. Cohen advised the group that all PDRP sections discussed to date are on Sharepoint. The group should be able to find their comments on there and confirm if they have been adequately addressed in the draft plan sections. The PowerPoint handout explains the tasking for the recovery branches and groups. The tasking is broken up by short-term and intermediate/long-term disaster objectives. Mr. Cohen pointed out the lead agencies and requested the group makes sure they approve of how the agencies are tasked. The Capital Repairs RF is tasked to DPWES as the lead agency.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that he thought DPWES had sent comments in terms of its role vs. FMDs role. DPWES would generally be contracted by FMD, in the case of say a temporary relocation. FMD tends to handle building repairs, but if the building is leveled DPWES would have a role in terms of the design and construction. All the county facilities are under the control of FMD; DPWES does whatever FMD needs to enact repairs or reconstruction. Some (minor) repairs, FMD can handle. Larger scale is when DPWES will get involved.

Mr. McKernan asked what departments are tasked for the Transportation RF.

Mr. Cohen stated the co-leads would be DOT or DPWES with VDOT as a support agency.

Mr. Kirkpatrick explained the engineering component is what Fairfax DOT does, DPWES' role is construction. DPWES will implement projects that are planned, funded, and designed by Fairfax DOT. DPWES does the construction administration and contracting.

Mr. Teitelman stated that DPWES involvement would on the facility being constructed, if it is a building structure (ex. Parking), DOT would hand it over to DPWES.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated DPWES' role would be similar how they work with FMD on the building construction. Most of the roads in the county, virtually all, are under VDOT.

Mr. Teitelman stated some of the parking structures are under VDOT. The issues have been discussed with VDOT, as to whether they handle the design or construction. Fairfax DOT typically deals with them as liaisons.

Mr. Kirkpatrick explained that DPWES would be the support agency to Fairfax DOT's liaison with VDOT.

Mr. McKernan asked if it would be appropriate to have Fairfax DOT and VDOT as co-leads.

Mr. Kirkpatrick explained that DPWES' involvement would depend on the situation.

Mr. Cohen stated there are other organizations involved in the transportation RF including WMATA, etc.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that VDOT will guide its own actions. VDOT will follow its own plan.

Mr. Teitelman stated he thinks it would be similar to the response to the snow emergency last year. The county has their operation and VDOT has their own. The county took a strong part in the process, through coordination with VDOT.

Mr. Cohen asked the group to review the new RF section for Natural and Cultural Resources. He explained that under Natural Resources Dept. of Planning and Zoning has been listed as lead agency. Under cultural resources we have planning and zoning, public works

Mr. McKernan suggested the Park Authority be listed as a tasked agency too.

Mr. Cohen agreed to list the Park Authority as an agency also. Mr. Cohen asked where the Stormwater Division of DPWES and Flood Plain Management go?

Ms. Lamborn stated she would think those agencies would be appropriately tasked to Natural Resources.

Mr. Cohen stated that due to the fact Dept. of Planning and Zoning and DPWES have other RF tasks, it would make sense to have the Park Authority as a lead agency for Natural and Cultural Resources.

Mr. Teitelman offered to present the question regarding the Transportation RF to VDOT.

Mr. Heffern asked if the county would want Fairfax DOT has the lead and work with VDOT on an as needed basis.

Mr. McKernan explained that capabilities of Fairfax DOT and VDOT, he stated VDOT has the stuff (equipment, staff, etc.), but the County should maintain the ability to direct some of the resources the way the County wants. I think it is a co-leadership situation.

Mr. Teitelman requested confirmation that he should present the issue to VDOT.

Ms. Phan stated a few representatives from VDOT attended the workshop last fall; however they are not familiar with the draft material.

Ms. McHugh asked what the difference is between a lead and supporting agency. She stated it seems that the supporting agencies are the ones with the stuff, and the lead agency coordinates. It seems like if we make the argument for VDOT to take the lead because they have the stuff. That could be done in other functional areas too.

Mr. McKernan expressed his thought that it comes down to who has authority. In this case, VDOT has the authority and the resources.

Mr. Cohen explained that the planning team has discussed holding a transportation focus group meeting. He stated that maybe the planning team should do that and feel out some of these issues. He explained that for some of these tasks the lead agency serves as the coordinator and everyone else has the resources. Regarding the agricultural group, the only function it has is monitoring animal and plant disease; he didn't know if there is an agency that is fit for this. There were a number of discussion points made at the Dec. meeting relative to prioritization of infrastructure restoration. Mr. Cohen said the points made during that meeting will be folded into the policy group discussion at a higher level. The group descriptions will be filled in once the higher policy group issues and prioritization are flushed out.

Mr. Cohen began the group review of the Housing Recovery Function. He stated the comments from last time have been reflected and are on SharePoint. The Housing Function has been broken out into intermediate and long-term housing groups. In intermediate housing the tasks are about providing housing and long-term is about supporting the private-sector and individuals trying to rebuild. Mr. Cohen stated the need to review the lead agencies and make sure it all tracks. Intermediate housing lead agency is family services, OEM, and then housing and community development. Which one of those would have lead at a given time would be at the discretion of the recovery command.

Ms. McHugh asked what qualifies as a support organization.

Mr. Cohen explained the support organizations can be tapped for resources, staff, experience, network, etc. To that point, OPA will be aligned with the public information office at the top of the org chart. Long-term housing lead agencies are OEM and housing and community development.

Mr. Turner said he was involved with long-term housing issues in California after the earthquake. From his experience with that, he assumes FEMA would step in and provide us support.

Mr. Cohen stated that in New Orleans, LA it was housing reconstruction was mostly administered by HUD funds and then later facilitation was turned over to the state.

Mr. McKernan stated that he didn't know if OEM would be a lead agency in this.

Mr. Turner stated that the role of Housing and Community Development (Housing) is to look at long-term housing; they are the lead on that. Anything Housing gets involved in they have the housing authority that must give final approval. He stated that he thought it is right that Housing is tasked as the lead agency.

Mr. Cohen stated the housing authority is a powerful tool. During a previous meeting, planning and zoning requested that they be removed to a support agency from lead agency in regards to long-term housing.

Mr. Turner stated Housing would need assistance from the Dept. of Planning and Zoning.

Mr. McKernan stated he thought the Dept. of Planning and Zoning are usually important, they will be a huge component, but once that is done; Housing and Community Development would be the lead.

Mr. Lyttle stated the list of supporting agencies for Housing does not include Volunteer Fairfax or VOAD. Those agencies should be listed for both intermediate and long-term housing.

Mr. Stern stated Citizen Corp should be listed as a Housing support agency.

Mr. Cohen stated that Volunteer Fairfax and Citizen Corp are listed under intermediate housing, he asked if the agencies though they should be listed under long-term housing as well.

Mr. Sterne replied yes.

Mr. McKernan stated he thought VOAD should definitely be included, because they bring people in from other places to help.

Mr. Stratoudakis asked which agency looks at land that is available for intermediate/long-term housing. He asked if that agency would be Planning and Zoning?

Mr. Cohen stated that question would depend on how much land is available to relocation the displaced population. Potential options should be considered pre-event. Mr. Cohen explained that decision would come out of the Planning Function and to a degree a support function here.

Mr. McKernan stated he thought the issue would also depend on the situation. It may be an issue or may not; depends on the incident.

Ms. McHugh asked for the definition of short-term/intermediate/and long-term housing?

Mr. Cohen explained that short-term housing is sheltering. Long-term housing is where you stay once your life is put back together. Intermediate housing is whatever goes in between living in a shelter and rebuilding your house.

Ms. McHugh asked if those definitions are spelled out in the plan.

Mr. Cohen agreed the definitions should be provided in the plan. He stated he would confirm the inclusion of those definitions and check the purpose to make sure it is clear.

Review New Draft Plan Elements

Mr. Cohen explained the three items to review under new draft plan elements. Last session, the group had some discussion of a policy group. This would sit somewhere above or parallel to the recovery coordinator. The planning team looked at best practices options how this might be set up. The planning team has taken some case studies from Louisiana, Iowa, California, and two examples

that are from recovery entities from Florida. On each page there is a different variable for the case study groups and look at how they address some of these issues. There are boards; in almost every case with advisory power. In the case of the Louisiana Recovery Agency (LRA), largely because the public opinion of government in LA, they had a separate entity to approve funding. Mr. Cohen asked of those three columns, if there was one the Steering Committee didn't feel was an option. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated he would be surprised if the Board of Supervisors (BOS) gave funding approval to another group.

Mr. Stratoudakis asked if the purpose of the group could just be to make recommendation on funding utilization.

Mr. Heffern explained a scenario where they could provide recommendations to the BOS for funding. He stated he could see a scenario where you wouldn't want to put out that the BOS wouldn't have final funding authority. He didn't think they would be offended by a recommendation of funding, not review or approval.

Mr. Cohen asked the group if they thought the slides presented are a good basis for this discussion.

Mr. McKernan stated he didn't see anything here we wouldn't want to discuss.

Mr. Cohen explained how the members of the best practice policy groups are chosen. He stated the clear tendency, in Fairfax County, would be appoint members by the County Executive and BOS or just BOS.

Mr. Heffern stated that in a few cases, the exec would make a recommendation and the BOS would approve.

Mr. Cohen asked the group if they thought there should be any type of geographic distribution specified.

Mr. Sterne stated that the disaster could be big enough to affect the county as a whole.

Mr. Cohen explained the geographic specification in LA was to assure the public that NOLA wasn't taking all of the money from Baton Rouge, and so forth.

Mr. Cohen explained who would serve on the board for the best practices examples. For the most part agency/department heads serve on the board. Only LA, were legislative members of the board. Also, some allowed civic leaders on the board, some with voting and some groups had them as non-voting. Government liaisons generally were representatives were from municipalities. He stated that unless, anyone has an objection, the agency and civic leaders would be the logical part of this entity.

Mr. Heffern expressed his thought that the plan needs to define government liaisons, including a list of towns, cities, etc. instead.

Mr. Sterne asked if the federal government was considered.

Mr. Cohen explained the fact that the feds own a large amount of land in the county may be something to consider.

Mr. Cohen then explained the chain of command for the policy group. The recovery agency will report to the county exec, but it is still questioned who this board would report to. There is no best practice for this.

Mr. Stratoudakis said if the EOC was activated, the OEM and the County Executive will sit at the head table. During the disaster phase they will inform the supervisors. He asked if that closed down, and this function stood up; wouldn't it be a similar reporting chain.

Mr. McKernan stated that through the transition to recovery there should be an effort to maintain transparency. It is a question for the County Executive and BOS. If the BOS is deciding who is on the policy board, Mr. McKernan thinks that they will want them to report to the BOS.

Mr. Cohen stated the organization will consist of a board/commission/etc, under that in all cases there are topical subcommittees or task forces comprised of external people and internal members. This allows having a board but also bringing in a special task force that is comprised of say WMATA, VDOT, Dulles Airport, etc. for transportation or infrastructure issues. Having an external task force provides more freedom and political coverage, bringing more people into the process. The internal subcommittees, were because they didn't have the external members or a way to determine how municipalities will work together. He explained there is a balance to be made between having committees that bog down the process and making sure opinions of external players are heard.

Mr. Cohen described the entities' meeting and reporting structures. The meetings are typically open to the public. In LA the votes were taken in public but the work was done during executive sessions.

Ms. Lamborn asked if there is a list of typical duties of a group like this, including a little more than policy. She stated she thought the groups would do things outside of funding. She asked if there were group charters available for review.

Mr. Cohen explained that the charters are typically pretty vague. The groups don't tie their hands very firmly.

Ms. Lamborn stated that the role would help steer who is a member of the group.

Mr. Cohen stated the planning team would look deeper, but the language tends to be vague to allow them to set their own agendas easily.

Mr. Cohen explained that last thing new item on the agenda was the Economic Recovery Functions. As noted before, the Steering Committee the issues and tasks discussed with the Chambers of Commerce is reflected in the section. The comments made by Finance, Insurance, Real Estate (FIRE) sector are not reflected. The Economic Recovery Function is broken into three groups including, Employment, Business Retention and Recruitment, and Supply Chain. He stated that the things that a mentioned crossover from provision during response and provision during recovery. The draft material is on the SharePoint site in this meeting's folder. For Employment, the lead agency is the Department of Family Services-Employment Training services. Most of the functions would be in the intermediate recovery phase and the lead agency will serve an advocacy role.

Mr. Cohen provided a description of the Business Restoration, Retention, and Recruitment Group. The lead agency is the Economic Development Agency. The pre-disaster objectives involve recruitment of business and development of partnerships assistance networks. Short-term objectives and strategies would be largely an advocacy function, to make sure business and private

firm interests are serviced and leveraging local business with recovery capabilities. The major objective here is addressing emergency loans and bridge financing. Depending on the situation, the objective of retaining business in FFX County could become a challenge.

Mr. Cohen then explained the Supply Chain group. He stated the lead agencies are OEM and Office of Public and Private Partnerships.

Mr. Kirkpatrick asked why DPWES is listed as support.

Mr. Cohen stated that the planning team thought the agencies that maintain supply routes should be listed here. The planning team is trying to decide whether transportation entities should be listed here.

Ms. Phan stated it would be helpful in cases like that to list specific divisions having a role within the department listed, so it could be determined why that department.

Ms. Lamborn agreed.

Mr. Kirkpatrick asked if DOT or VDOT are listed as support agencies to identify the business essential supply chain routes and utility connections.

Mr. Cohen requested that those departments with a stake in this function review the draft material closely.

Next steps

Ms. Phan asked the Steering Committee to have comments back by March 23. She requested that Mr. Bolton report back the Chambers of Commerce on the content of the section for their comments.

Mr. Bolton suggested that Eileen Curtis be contacted to solicit feedback from the Chambers of Commerce.

Ms. Phan stated she has been in contact with one of her office. Ms. Phan also informed the group that the next steering committee meeting will be at MPSTOC on April 6th.

Meeting Adjourned